



WILEY

Review

Author(s): N. B. Dearle

Review by: N. B. Dearle

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 126 (Jun., 1922), pp. 222-225

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2223267>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 22:57 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Economic Society, *Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
The Economic Journal

Tawney writes as if they were wholly true of to-day, and that is an unpardonable delusion.

GEORGE W. GOUGH

Labour in Transition: A Survey of British Industrial History since 1914. By WILLIAM AYLOTT ORTON, M.A. (Cantab.), M.Sc. (London). (London: Philip Allan & Co., 1921. Pp. xxiv + 286.)

The Frontier of Control: A Study of British Workshop Politics. By CARTER L. GOODRICH. With a Foreword by R. H. TAWNEY. (London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1920. Pp. xvi + 277. Price 7s. 6d. net.)

THE subjects of these two books, both the wider one of the position of labour, and the narrower one of the nature and meaning of control, have produced much, and often embittered, controversy. Indeed, there has been some danger that the real and vital facts would be overlaid, and overlooked, owing to the arguments and theorising that they have called forth. It was most necessary, therefore, that the matter should be dealt with, both historically, as is done by Mr. Orton, and critically by Mr. Goodrich, in a serious attempt to elucidate the facts. And this is the chief of the many merits of these books. Both are excellent in style and matter and deal thoroughly and fairly with their subjects; but their scientific treatment is their greatest virtue. It may be added that a brief but most suggestive introduction to Mr. Goodrich's book is provided by Mr. Tawney, who shows a gift for succinctly epitomising the facts and tendencies which Mr. Orton and Mr. Goodrich set out in detail.

Mr. Orton's task, which amounted to an attempt to trace the history of labour since the outbreak of the Great War, was necessarily difficult. Not only is much of the information fragmentary and hard to piece together, but the war itself brought a great confusion in, and alteration of, standpoints. There is, further, the very real difference in the meaning to be attached to control. The mass of working-class feeling itself is a tangle of varying, often conflicting, ideas; and while, before the war, "strictly within the lower and broader stages (of society), there has been growing up for near a century a sullen 'class-consciousness' founded for what it was worth almost entirely on a community of economic disabilities," this as yet had no clear and definite expression. With the war, a more definite formulation

began with the shop stewards and the movement for workers' control; whilst, along with this, and not necessarily in conformity with it, the Trade Union movement was seeking to retain and extend its existing privileges. It is no small achievement of Mr. Orton to have brought the thread of his narrative so clearly through the tangle of war and post-war years; and the coolness of his judgment is commendable. He is never afraid to criticise, and yet his criticisms are always well-balanced. His work, too, is very readable.

It must be sufficient to refer to a few more salient points. To begin with, he sets out clearly the real danger and difficulty during the war in the position of the skilled workman, "among whom what skill at lathe or forge or loom a man had gained was his one precious possession, to be protected against exploitation as a richer man might guard his jewels against the thief." In this lay the real problem of dilution, and it is well that the matter should be emphasised. Unfortunately, the attitude adopted at an early stage in the war was calculated to increase rather than to diminish the fear of change. Mr. Orton analyses the possible means of increasing the supply of munitions. It is significant that the first attempt appears to have been on lines which endangered the position of the artisan, and yet were less promising than the policy of extending contracts among firms not hitherto engaged on munitions, which was comparatively neglected, or at least received less attention. It is probable, indeed, that suspicions thus engendered during the spring of 1914 had intensified the subsequent difficulties of the dilution scheme. One point that perhaps Mr. Orton might have emphasised more than he has done is the very special way in which the trades represented by the A.S.E. were threatened; for this goes far to account for any special difficulties that arose with them.

Moreover, Mr. Orton brings out admirably the psychological element in the problem. To reach a settlement with the Trade Union leaders, better informed of the national position and of the safeguards provided, was one thing. The real test came when the agreed changes were applied in the individual workshops. On this Mr. Tawney says: "The condition of carrying out the reorganisation effectively was the consent of all engaged in the industry. . . . When, as in the textile trades, that representative machinery worked effectively the emergency was met with comparatively little difficulty. When, as in the engineering trades, the policy was to force drastic innovations upon workers who were not consulted with regard to them, the result was endless

friction." It may be added that, as regards this last point, Mr. Orton's view of the dilution policy in engineering seems appreciably less severe.

Mr. Orton is fully alive to the less desirable elements in the Labour movement, and sets out clearly the growth of revolutionary or anti-patriotic elements or ideas. His concluding chapter is most interesting, and should be carefully studied. It shows a clear perception of the difficulties of immediate extensions of workers' control, and rests its hopes rather in a movement "slowly broadening down from precedent to precedent."

Mr. Goodrich set himself narrower limits, namely, to investigate the meaning of control, to explain why it is demanded, and to attempt to discover exactly how much of it exists; or, in Mr. Tawney's very apt words, "we must know exactly how much control is wanted, and control over what, and through whom it is to be exercised." The work requires in some ways different qualities from that of Mr. Orton. For it is primarily critical and analytical, whilst *Labour in Transition* is more historical and descriptive. Again, to quote Mr. Tawney: "Mr. Goodrich brings the wide background of a student of economics, and a dash of charming scepticism, which to one heated by the somewhat feverish temperature of British industry during the last two years is as refreshing as the ice at the close of an American dinner." He has also an admirable sense of humour and is fully alive to the lighter incidents of the struggle for control.

Perhaps the best parts of the book are the opening and closing chapters. The first analyses admirably the meaning of the demand for control. Mr. Goodrich throughout aims rather at stating facts than at arguing on principles. In the closing chapter, however, he attempts to lay down what control means in order to be able to give some estimate as to how far it has gone, and distinguishes between "positive" and "negative," "customary" and "contagious," "agreeable" and "enforced," "dependent" and "independent," control. The last term means control taken or enforced as a right, not received as a gift, where the workers' side "does actually exert an independent force." This, he considers, "seems . . . the broadest sense in which the term 'control' can be used with any significance."

In the intervening chapters the author deals subject by subject with the different branches of workshop life, and shows how they have been affected by the movement for control. He excluded deliberately such questions of wages and hours as belong primarily to ordinary Trade Union policy, as not coming rightly within the

special problem. These chapters, too, are excellent, though certain criticisms of detail are possible. For instance, the work of Trade Unions in finding places for their members seems to be underestimated. But these, after all, are small points. They detract little from the value of the work.

N. B. DEARLE

Insurance against Unemployment, with Special Reference to British and American Conditions. By JOSEPH L. COHEN, B.A. (Cantab.), M.A. (Columbia, U.S.A.), "Richard Watson Gilder" Fellow in Economics (Columbia). (London: P. S. King & Son, 1921.)

INSURANCE as a means of mitigating the loss caused by natural contingencies—death, sickness, fire, shipwreck—has long been known and practised among civilised peoples. Insurances against losses which are only partially the work of nature, and are largely caused by human institutions and circumstances, are a more recent development. Unemployment, for which Mr. Cohen offers the following as a definition, "A workman is unemployed when he is able-bodied, efficient and, though willing to work in his own trade at the current rate of pay, is unable to find employment because of lack of work," is such a mixed event. An instance of insurance against unemployment that arises from natural causes is given by the Friendly Societies of House-painters. Their employment only lasts for part of the year and is necessarily suspended during the winter, when they will be reduced to distress unless they have some other and supplemental employment for that season. This risk they provide against by contributing to a common fund during the part of the year in which their work is continuous and well paid. Apart from these occupational societies, Friendly Societies often make grants to members while out of work. They cannot offer to such members a definite insurance, as they do to members while sick, for the risk is not one capable of such estimation beforehand as would justify the entering into a definite contract to make it in respect of an agreed contribution to an adequate fund for that purpose.

The Trade Unions were more favourably situated. Having to do with a single trade, with the ups and downs of which they were familiar, they could insure out-of-work pay under better conditions than were open to the Friendly Societies; but they